

**Amendments to the Drawings**

**Fig. 13** has been amended to switch the "Yes" and "No" indicators at **Block 1300**, thereby aligning the figure with its corresponding text on **Page 42**, lines 12 - 18 of the Specification. No new matter has been introduced.

### REMARKS

The Title, Specification, and Drawings have been amended. Claims 1, 3 - 6, 8 - 9, 11 - 15, 22, 24 - 27, 32, and 34 - 40 have been amended to clarify the subject matter of Applicants' claimed invention. Claims 45 - 58 have been added. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments or added claims, all of which are supported in the specification as originally filed. Claims 2, 23, and 33 have been cancelled from the application without prejudice (and Claims 16 - 21, 28 - 31, and 41 - 44 have been previously withdrawn). Claims 1, 3 - 15, 22, 24 - 27, 32, 34 - 40, and 45 - 58 are now in the application.

#### I. Proposed Drawings Corrections

A proposed replacement drawing is provided herewith for Fig. 13, as discussed above in "Amendments to the Drawings". No new matter has been introduced with this proposed replacement drawing.

#### II. Objection to the Specification

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action dated January 13, 2006 (hereinafter, "the Office Action") states that the Specification is objected to because of informalities. Appropriate amendments have been provided herein, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

#### III. Objection to the Claims

Serial No. 10/058,689

-20-

RSW920020011US1

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action states that Claim 37 is objected to because of incorrect dependency. Appropriate corrections have been provided herein, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

IV. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action states that Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Appropriate corrections have been provided herein, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

V. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Paragraph 9 of the Office Action states that Claims 1 - 15, 22 - 27, and 32 - 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 6,279,113 to Vaidya. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended their independent Claims 1, 22, and 32 to more clearly specify limitations of their claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that Vaidya does not teach all limitations of these independent claims, as will now be discussed.

Applicants' independent Claim 1 specifies limitations of:

- “defining a plurality of intrusion suspicion levels ...” (Claim 1, line 3 - 5, emphasis added);

- “for each of a plurality of potential intrusion events, defining a set of at least one conditions which describe the potential intrusion event” (Claim 1, lines 6 - 7); and
- “associating one of the defined intrusion suspicion levels with each of the sets of conditions” (Claim 1, lines 8 - 9, emphasis added).

Independent Claims 22 and 32 specify similar limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Vaidya does not teach, nor suggest, these limitations. The Office Action cites Vaidya, col. 7, line 52 - col. 8, line 15 for teaching intrusion suspicion levels. Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization of Vaidya., and respectfully submit that the clarifications made herein to their independent claims remove any confusion between Vaidya’s “sequential” profiles (which require investigating more than one incoming packet) and Vaidya’s “timer/counter”-based profiles (which also require investigating more than one incoming packet). In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Vaidya does not teach “defining” (or “defined”) intrusion suspicion levels, and does not teach “associating” such defined suspicion levels with sets of conditions.

Applicants’ independent Claim 1 also specifies limitations of:

- “defining a plurality of sensitivity levels for filtering intrusion events when performing the intrusion detection processing” (Claim 1, lines 10 - 11, emphasis added; notably, the sensitivity levels specified in lines 10 - 11 are

distinct from the suspicion levels specified in lines 3 - 5); and

- “performing intrusion detection for a particular inbound communication received for the computing device, further comprising steps of:  
determining whether any of the at least one sets of conditions are matched; and  
if so, using a currently-applicable one of the defined sensitivity levels, in concert with the intrusion suspicion level associated with the matched conditions, to determine if the particular inbound communication should be treated as an intrusion event”  
(Claim 1, lines 12 - 18, emphasis added).


Independent Claims 22 and 32 specify similar limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Vaidya does not teach, nor suggest, these limitations. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Vaidya does not teach “defining” (or “defined”) sensitivity levels, and does not use sensitivity levels “in concert with” suspicion levels to determine if inbound communications should be treated as intrusion events.

Accordingly, it can be seen that Applicants’ independent Claims 1, 22, and 32 are patentably distinct from Vaidya. In view of the patentability of the independent claims, Applicants respectfully submits that their dependent Claims 3 - 15, 24 - 27, 34 - 40, and 45 - 58 are patentable over Vaidya. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §102 rejection.

**VI. Conclusion**

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,



Marcia L. Doubet  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 43168  
Phone: 407-343-7586  
Fax: 407-343-7587

Attachment: Replacement Sheet (1)